

**SPF/SIG Executive Committee Meeting  
January 19, 2007  
Indiana Government Center 1 pm to 3 pm**

**Attendance:**

**DMHA Staff:** Mary Lay, Dave Bozell, Martha Payne, Janet Grissom, John Viernes

**This is was a special meeting of the SPF SIG Executive Committee**

**Purpose**

Marcia French provided the committee with an overview of what had occurred at the technical assistance meeting on January 12, 2007 with Jo Brickmeyer from PIRE. Jo came to Indiana and worked with the staff and others to streamline the Indiana Strategic Plan and bring it into line with the SAMHSA/CSAP expectations.

**Recommendations for change/modification**

- Reduce the number of funded priorities down to 3 from 6
- Focus the RFS on funding Planning for the communities and not programming
- Provide communities at least the first 6-12 months of their awards to focus on the Assessment and Planning Phases of the SPF Process
- Prioritize who will receive funding based on highest need/highest contributor model

Jo reminded the staff at the TA meeting that the work of the SEOW is seen as part of the overall state substance abuse prevention effort and not just a SPF effort. It is hoped that the SEOW will live on beyond the life of SPF and institutionalize the use data by states and communities to make decisions on funding and programming. It was also discussed that the recommendation was to reduce the number of priorities being funded with SPF dollars, not reduce the priorities. The six priorities will remain true for Indiana; the only change is to focus the limited SPF dollars on fewer.

## Priority Selection

Dr. Wright presented the group a worksheet of the six priorities that looked at Capacity, Preventability/Changeability and Community Readiness/Political Will—scoring all the priorities in these areas, three priorities clearly became the top choices

Alcohol—which is an issue across the state

Cocaine—which is a localized or “hot spot” issue

Methamphetamine- which is a localized or “hot spot” issue

**Action:** The Executive Committee reviewed this worksheet. It was moved to be approved, seconded and approved.

The next action was to look at funding strategy. Marcia French presented CSAP’s recommendation on how we should plan to fund. It is recommended that we focus

60% of available community funding on Alcohol

20% of available community funding on Cocaine

20% of available community funding on Methamphetamine

**Action**—a motion was made to accept this and it was seconded. There was some discussion as to why this split—it was agreed upon that since alcohol was our top priority reaching most of the state, that most of the funding should be directed there...This funding will assure that the majority of funds will go to our biggest issue.

The Executive Committee approved the motion. The funding strategy was approved.

## Community Selection

Dr. Wright provided the group with tables listing each county and how the rank for each of the 3 selected priorities.

**Action:** It was moved that the community funding priority be based on a community falling in the top 10% of being either the highest need or highest contributor community on the tables provide by Dr. Wright. Seconded and Approved.

Meeting was adjourned.